

REMARKS

Claims 1-20 and 22-32 are presently pending. Claim 19 has been canceled herein. Claims 33-37 have been added herein. Support for these claims is found at least at page 5, line 20 through page 6, line 20 and FIGS. 3-7 of the originally patent application. No new matter has been added.

Rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 102

The Examiner rejected Claims 1-3, 11, 12, 15, 17, 18, 20, and 22 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Dinan *et al.* (U.S. Patent 5,212,898).

Independent Claim 1 has been amended to recite that each washer spaces the overlay from the main body when the overlay is attached to the main body in the first position and the second position. This limitation is similar to that found in allowable Claims 23 and 32. The Examiner states in paragraph 16 of the Office Action that "Dinan discloses each fastener is movably secured to the overlay via a washer 75, however a washer does not space the overlay from the second surface of the main body when the overlay is attached to the main body". Independent Claim 22 has been similarly amended.

Independent Claim 17 has been amended to include the allowable subject matter of dependent Claim 19.

Accordingly, the rejection is believed to be overcome.

Rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 103

The Examiner rejected Claims 4-10 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Dinan *et al.* in view of Sarkisian *et al.* (U.S. Patent 5,675,923).

Independent Claim 1 has been amended to recite that each washer spaces the overlay from the main body when the overlay is attached to the main body in the first position and the

second position. It is respectfully submitted that Dinan *et al.* and Sarkisian *et al.*, taken individually or in combination, do not teach or suggest this limitation.

Accordingly, the rejection is believed to be overcome.

Allowable Subject Matter

The Examiner stated that Claims 13, 14, and 19 were "objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims."

Claims 13 and 14 depend from Claim 1, which is believed to contain patentable subject matter. As set forth above, the limitations of Claim 19, which has been canceled herein, have been incorporated into independent Claims 17.

The Examiner is respectfully thanked for the allowance of Claims 16 and 23-32.

CONCLUSION

In view of the above amendments and remarks, it is believed that all claims are in condition for allowance, and it is respectfully requested that the application be passed to issue. If the Examiner believes that a telephone conference would expedite prosecution of this case, the Examiner is invited to call the undersigned.

Respectfully submitted,

HAMILTON, BROOK, SMITH & REYNOLDS, P.C.

By 

Erik L. Ence

Registration No. 42,511

Telephone: (978) 341-0036

Facsimile: (978) 341-0136

Dated: August 10, 2004
Concord, Massachusetts 01742-9133